DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 339 947 CG 023 848

AUTHOR Guss, Thomas
TITLE Integrating Underemployment and Hardship: Using Locus of Control To Develop a Profile among Married Men.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 34p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Employment Problems; *Locus of Control; *Males; Marital Satisfaction; *Marriage; Personality Traits; *Underemployment

ABSTRACT

Prior to 1986, economic conditions had resulted in substantial unemployment, layoffs, and reduced work time, and had produced underemployment and income reductions for families. Debilitating outcomes in such a situation are likely to depend upon a volatile blend of marital and personal qualities between spouses. Given the arguments regarding the role of marital issues and individual characteristics in hardship, and the emphasis in the literature of the traditional provider role, there is a need to explore the experience of underemployment among married men. Consequently, only husbands were selected for this project. Their perception of important marital interactions and individual qualities were utilized to clarify the phenomenon of vulnerability. A random sample of a non-metropolitan northwest community produced 137 couples with a variety of incomes. Twenty-one of them lived on incomes reduced by at least 30 percent. Using data from selected marital and individual qualities among husbands, discriminant function analysis elicted three locus of control subscales that maximized the difference between the hardship and nonhardship groups. Husbands in hardship were more oriented to chance, while nonhardship providers were more internal. Results suggest that locus of control is a distinguishing characteristic among married men. Further research is necessary regarding underemployment, marriage traits, and personal qualities. Part of the developmental process for married men, and recovery from vulnerability, may lie in their willingness to take individual responsibility, and the style and degree this allows spouses and others who care to participate. (LLL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED339947

Integrating Underemployment and Hardship: Using Locus of Control to Develop a Profile Among Married Men *

** Thomas Guss

Fort Hays State University

* Research for this paper was supported by a grant from the Agricultural Experiment Station, Regional Project W-167 (Technical Paper #8358): Coping with Stress: Adaptation of Nonmetropolitan Families to Socioeconomic change.

** Thomas Guss is an Assistant Professor of Counseling and Educational Studies, Fort Hays State University, Hays, KS.

CG023848

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Thomas O. Guss

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

2 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The author gratefully acknowledges the contribution of Arisa Zvonkovic for use of this data. Her review of earlier drafts and those of two anonymous reviewers are appreciated.

KEY WORDS: Underemployment, Hardship, Perceived Control, Marital Quality

Abstract

Prior to 1986, economic conditions resulted in substantial unemployment, layoffs, and reduced work time which produce underemployment and income reductions for families. A random sample of a non-metropolitan northwest community produced 137 couples with a variety of incomes. Twenty-one of them lived on incomes reduced by at least 30 percent. Using data from selected marital and individual qualities among husbands, discriminant function analysis elicited three locus of control subscales which maximized the difference between the hardship (N=21) and nonhardship (N=116) groups ($p < .05$). Further, husbands in hardship were more oriented to chance ($p < .05$), while nonhardship providers were more internal ($p < .05$). Results suggest that locus of control is a distinguishing characteristic among married men.

An Integration of Underemployment and Hardship: Using Locus of Control to Develop a Profile Among Married Men

Many couples living in poverty actually had at least one spouse underemployed, either working full-time, part-time for inadequate wages, or otherwise employed at subsistence levels (Bluestone, Murphy & Stevenson, 1983; Schiller, 1984). Underemployment portrays the worker functioning at the best job available, and more adequately than no employment, describes the characteristic of a weakened connection to the labor market. While at least 25% of the national labor force is underemployed, there are substantial differences depending on the occupational type. For example, the rate is 22.8% in the non-agricultural sector, i.e., manufacturing, and 43% in agriculture (Sullivan, 1978). Therefore, it accounts for a variety of employment change during economic transition. Kampe and Lindemood (1969) calculated underemployment rates throughout the nation. They found 2500 of the 3100 counties (80%) were underemployed. Despite this normative feature and the diminished ability of underemployed workers to provide for their families, unemployment received more attention from researchers (Burris, 1983; King, 1977). The rationale here emphasizes the use of underemployment as a concept to describe several types of marginal employment. Also, each employment mode features significant financial hardship as a common characteristic. This integration will allow for comparisons of employment styles using individual and marital characteristics to make distinctions.

An Occupational Continuum

Underemployment was often operationally defined to describe discrete occupational situations. Job skills relative to position, loss of income through re-employment, and wage reductions at a current job were models for variable development (Berg, Freedman & Freeman, 1978; Glyde, 1977; Sullivan, 1978). Difficulty in estimates seemed to result from the emphasis in labor market statistics on work status and hours worked rather than changes in work hours and income (Moen, 1980). Therefore, definitions of underemployment which evolved from this perspective were likely to utilize a variety of discrete categories. Descriptions portrayed a match between occupation and skill, and specific samples generated inconsistent outcomes. Another perspective portrayed employment as a continuous process with unemployment and full employment as bipolar. Within, a number of positions accounted for the blend of occupational status, job satisfaction, and income (Moen, 1980).

Often, the concept used in the traditional perspective to describe marginality is structural unemployment (Herr & Cramer, 1988). It described employment when a workers' skill was underutilized and undervalued compared to those of similar training (Glyde, 1977). Economic conditions often indicated many primary workers experienced downgrading (Bishop, 1977; Clogg, 1979; Levitan, Mangun & Marshall, 1981; Gordus, Jarley & Ferman. 1981; Slifman, 1976). Plants closed and layoffs (Healey, 1984), work-time (O'Farrell & Crouchley, 1985) and wage reductions began in manufacturing and durable goods industries

in the early 1980's. Some estimated the underemployment from these corporate strategies constituted more than half the reported unemployment rate (Bednarzik, 1983). In other words, substantial numbers of workers experienced periods of underemployment because skills were dated or no longer applied to a particular company. However, the workers were not employed.

A second category, frictional unemployment, labels the time lag between ending a job and beginning another (Herr & Cramer, 1988). Structural change often resulted in increases in some jobs, i.e., service occupations. The service sector was characterized by low wages, high turnover, limited advancement (Gordon, 1972), and perhaps poverty (Flaim, 1984). Highly skilled, experienced, and employed much of the year, workers were exposed to a period of unemployment, a job search, and new employment at a reduced level. Affects on worker self-esteem (Kirchler, 1983) was substantial, even though workers were likely to appear only briefly in unemployment data. Outcomes were not restricted to individual workers but included adjustment in lifestyle within families and was often long-term (Moen, Kain, & Elder, 1983).

There are a variety of jobs which require periods of time during the year when work at that occupation is not available. Carpentry in parts of the country, logging in northwest states, and many agricultural jobs fall in this category. This is termed seasonal unemployment (Herr & Cramer, 1988), although an individual was working at the occupation of choice for much of the year. These workers supplemented their income doing part-

time work in the secondary job market (Leff & Haft, 1983), odd-jobs, employment reimbursed by cash, and labor bartering (Degrazia, 1982; Molefsky, 1982). As a result, they often did not have adequate income to meet the needs of their families (Hill & Corcoran, 1979), and were not accurately represented in unemployment statistics. Therefore, the conceptual narrowing of unemployment hinders the exploration of employment patterns, its role in the world of work, and its association with the family.

Capturing Underemployment: Hardship in the Family

Underemployment, then, applies to several employment situations which were often explored in terms of the unemployed status. In this way, important variable(s) were overlooked (Burris, 1983). However, unemployment of the provider predicted reductions in family quality and likely divorce (Voydanoff, 1983). These causal inferences, bypass the personal contributions of marital coping under circumstances brought on by the certain income loss resulting from underemployment. The dichotomous nature of the unemployment concept removes phenomena within financial coping procedures from empirical consideration. For example, early on there were survivors of hard times (Angell, 1936; Bakke, 1933; Elder, 1974; Komarovsky, 1964), and some couples were enriched (Zvonkovic, Guss & Ladd, 1988). Their experience is important in describing healthy marital and family interactions.

Hardship was identified as a concept to describe the association between employment disruption and relational adaptative experiences. However, the amount of income loss was

problematic (Caplowitz, 1978; Guadagno, 1983; Hill, 1949; Moen, 1979). It is likely, then, adjustment to income reduction within families contains within it resource and process issues which individual couples manage in characteristic ways. Inadequate income seemed to exacerbate (Moen, 1980) or initiate marital discord, conflict, and tension. The loss of occupational status by the provider may be incidental to adjustment to hardship by couples and families. This process may contain elements of vulnerability (Liker & Elder, 1983), instability, and reductions in relational quality.

Personal Characteristics

The vulnerability of some marriages during hard times may be accounted for by the husbands' awareness of how differences are resolved. When marginally employed (underemployed), men were isolated (Eisenberg & Lazarsfeld, 1938) and reluctant to actively pursue appropriate alternatives (Buss & Redburn, 1983; Elder, 1974; Gordus, Jarley & Ferman, 1981; Komarovsky, 1964; Levitan, Mangum & Marshall, 1981). Counter-productive strategies of these providers may be explained in part by poor choices while coping with feelings they experienced in hard times. Couples who actively share their experience may not be as vulnerable to marital misunderstanding as those who passively ride out the storm. Couples who were purposeful and active when hard pressed, suffered less (Saubourin, Laporte & Wright, 1990).

Debilitating outcomes are likely to represent volatile blend of marital and personal qualities between spouses. For example, a sense of control was related to marital coping

(McCubbin & Patterson, 1982), family conflict resolution and problem-solving (Menaghan, 1983), and marital adjustment during times of marginal employment (Moen, Kain & Elder, 1983). However, the orientation to control elicits a variety of outcomes. For example, externality was associated with individual outcomes like depression (Mirowsky & Ross, 1984), and helplessness or passivity (Abramson & Sackheim, 1977). Levenson (1974) found locus of control discriminated those who were active from those who accepted adversity more passively. However, internality was, also, a component of relational intensity (Ramey & Campbell, 1976), physical symptoms (Strube & Werner, 1985), and depression (Kirchler, 1983). Therefore, active strategies and a heightened sense of control, while desirable, was not consistently effective. Therefore, the most appropriate orientation during marital sharing is likely to vary depending on the context of the event developed within the marriage and its meaning to individuals.

Given these arguments regarding the role of marital issues and individual characteristics in hardship, and the emphasis in the literature reviewed of the traditional provider role, there is a need to explore the experience of underemployment among married men. Consequently, only husbands were selected for this project. Their perception of important marital interactions and individual qualities were utilized to clarify the phenomenon of vulnerability. Also, there are likely a number of types of marginal employment status (underemployment) within the hardship group. The intent in this group assignment was to capture as

many of the underemployed positions as possible within a common definition, and determine their characteristics. Similarly, within the non-hardship group were various types of employment adequacy and financial stability. The intent was to determine their shared qualities. It was possible, then, to compare groups for significant differences and refine underemployment definitions which emphasize status change and financial reduction.

METHODS

A northwest community was selected for the study because of its high rate of unemployment, substantial plant closure, company cut-backs and layoffs, and limited population movement. The sample was randomly selected from a telephone listing. The names identifying 629 households which were contacted by telephone to determine eligibility and willingness to participate. Eligibility was limited to intact married couples, and for the person listed in the telephone book to be a member of the work force. From this initial listing, 100 were retired, 50 were single, 41 were divorced, 32 were widow(er)s, and 4 were cohabitating. The telephones were disconnected from 59 households, and 6 were not contacted after repeated attempts. From the remaining 337 households, 154 refused to participate. Project investigators delivered surveys to the 183 couples who remained. Questionnaires were returned from 149 couples. Of these, 12 were not utilized because the people were retired, cohabitating and this was not discovered during the telephone

screening, or the returned survey(s) was not adequately filled out. Completed surveys from 137 couples were included in the analysis.

Participants

The people included in the survey lived in the local community for some time, and had not changed their locale following underemployment or hardship. They resemble by age the primary work groups described in other research (Table I). Demographic features indicated a degree of homogeneity. Those participating did not differ meaningfully by education level or employment status which are often indicators of social status. The income dimension appeared promising in establishing comparison groups.

The pattern of wives who were working was consistent with the nation, generally. Thirty-eight (28%) were working full-time at one job, six (4%) were self-employed, and six (4%) were working at more than one job. Twenty-seven percent of the women were working part-time at one job or self-employed. Thirty-nine percent of the wives were unemployed. Those who were not employed described themselves as predominantly homemakers, although a few were on layoff from a job, retired or assuming other roles.

PUT TABLE I ABOUT HERE

Both husbands and wives reported their total household income for 1985. Thirty husbands (23%) and twenty-eight wives (21%) indicated family income of $19,999 or less for the year. Forty-six husbands (34%) and forty-seven wives (36%) reported household income between $20,000 and $29,999. Forty-one of the married men (31%) and thirty-nine of the married women (30%) indicated household income between $30,000 and $49,999. Thirteen husbands (10%) and nine of the wives (7%) reported family income between $50,000 and $69,999. And six men (4%) and seven married women (5%) reported household income > = $70,000 for 1985. Four husbands (4%) and five wives (5%) did not respond to this item. Most of the couples (65%) reported household income of more than $20,000 and less than $50,000 for the year.

For this analysis, a 30% reduction in income by husbands was used as the criterion for separating participants into hardship and non-hardship groups. This amount was implicated in marital instability (Moen, 1979). Those with an income loss between 1984 and 1985 of 29% or less were grouped as nonhardship, and those with a 30% reduction or greater were placed in the hardship group. This was determined by creating a denominator of the household income for 1985 minus the 1984 income for husbands. The numerator was 100. If this was a negative value and met the criterion amount, it was coded a hardship case. Included in the hardship group were those men whose reported 1985 household income was less than $10,000 (less than the poverty level). There is likely some areas(s) of

similarity within both groups other than occupation status or income change. For this analysis, it was important to combine the variety of situations which seemed to involve underemployment, and distinguished it from employment adequacy. The purpose was to ascertain characteristic differences between the variety of underemployed and continuously employed types by isolating a clear hardship group. All others were assumed not experiencing hardship at this intensity, if at all.

Instruments

The affects of hardship on marital relationships was assessed in terms of the husbands' perception of the degree of agreement in several decision areas (consensus) and the degree of shared time and activities (cohesion). These qualities were measured with the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS) subscales for cohesion and consensus. The DAS subscales were determined internally consistent and reliable with coefficient alphas of: Dyadic Consensus, r = .90 and Dyadic Cohesion, r = .86 (Spanier, 1976). The consensus subscale is made up of 15 items in a Likert format containing 5 points where the participant might always agree or always disagree. The cohesion subscale is composed of 4 items in a 6-point Likert array and one item with a 5-point selection. A person can choose a range or response from never to more often than once each day regarding events between them and their spouse. Responses (N=116) included in an alpha reliability assessment on the cohesion subscale provided coefficient alpha, r = .76, and for consensus (N = 166), r = .89.

The personal attitude toward gender roles was assessed by the Attitude Toward Women (ATW) (Helmreich, Spence & Givson, 1980). Test-retest reliability by Person product-moment correlations are r = .89 to r = .95, and for females, r = .93 and males, r = .92 (Etaugh, 1975). The 23 items are arranged in a 4-point Likert format. In this sample (N=200), the reliability analysis elicited a alpha coefficient, r = .72.

An individual's orientation to achievement was measured by the Fear of Success Scale (FOSS) which assessed personal difference in the motive to avoid success (Zuckerman & Allison, 1976). These researchers estimated high levels of achievement motivation are negatively associated with a fear of success. Their research on known groups revealed females score significantly higher than males on the scale. All 5 items are arranged in a 4-point Likert array. Participants (N=245) included in the reliability analysis elicited coefficient alpha, r = .62.

The orientation to control was assessed using Levenson's (1974) locus of control scale. This instrument distinguishes between those who believe in chance (C), expectancy of control by powerful others (P), and perceived mastery over one's life (I). Each subscale contains 8 items arranged in a 6-point Likert format. Kuder-Richardson reliability coefficients yielded, r = .64 (I), r = .77 (P), and r = .78 (C) (Levenson, 1974). In this sample (N=238), the reliability analysis produced coefficient alphas, r = .53 (I), r = .69 (P), and r = .76 (C).

RESULTS

The purpose of this research was to examine differences between groups of married men, distinguished by income reduction (hardship), to determine how income loss was related to personal and spousal qualities, and the degree these characteristics contributed to a systematic profile. A display of variables included in the analysis are provided along with t-test estimates of significance. More than this, however, is necessary for the purpose to be achieved. To reach the desired end, it was necessary to accomplish three objectives.

PUT TABLE II ABOUT HERE

First, in order to classify cases into two mutually exclusive groups to differentiate between them, it was necessary to establish the important distinguishing characteristic. A variable which is well grounded in theory may be used in the grouping exercise (Tabachnick & Fidall, 1983). The concept of underemployment, featuring a variety of types, highlights hardship as a shared characteristic with distinctions made by degree (Hill, 1949; Guadagno, 1983; Moen, 1979). The effectiveness of this strategy can be assessed through canonical correlation which gives an indication for the strength of association between the formula and the original group assignment (Norusis, 1985). Its square (eta^2) may be interpreted as the proportion of variation accounted for by the function

(Klecka, 1980). In this case, both estimates are small but significant (Table III).

Second, in order to extend the profile of underemployment to determine vulnerability from financial loss, it is necessary to assess the degree variables were associated with marginal employment (underemployment) and determine which significantly distinguished the groups of hardship and non-hardship males.

PUT TABLE III ABOUT HERE

Discriminant Function Analysis

Discriminant analysis included the step-wise method of independent variable selection as an option in the statistical package. In this procedure, all independent variables were entered to determine a pattern or function which significantly distinguished the groups. Variables were entered until continuing did not refine the profile significantly. With six characteristics entered into the procedure, only the control variables (internality, control by others, and chance) entered the formula (Table III). At step 1, internal control entered the discriminating formula. The stepwise procedure accepted the smallest Wilks' Lamda at this stage (.96545). The equivalent F value for internality at step 1 (d.f. 1, 125) was 4.4731 ($p < .05$). To begin the procedure the significant F value must be larger than 3.92 (Norusis, 1985). No other variable met the criteria for a step 4. Also, there can be no additional functions since the maximum number is either the number of

groups or independent variables minus one, whichever is smaller (Tabachnick & Fidall, 1983).

Standardized canonical discriminant coefficients provided information regarding the relative contribution of each variable to the function. The interpretation is similar to beta weights in multiple regression (Norusis, 1985). The weightings of the discriminating function components were: .81 (chance), -.89 (others') and -.70 (internality). In the non-hardship group, control was more highly internal, yet perceived as coming from powerful others as well. Further, internality, while entering the profile first, is the least influential in its contribution to the overall function of perceived control among husbands. The orientation to control by powerful others, while only approaching significance ($p < .10$), is the most influential to the control function.

Classification

A third objective, assessing the fit of the formula to actual cases, can be achieved with the discriminant function program by matching each of the men to the established function. Since the dependent variable had two levels, by chance alone, placement is accurate 50% of the time. Accuracy greater than this was expected in a statistically generated formula (Thomas & Wister, 1984). The profile successfully predicted nearly two-thirds of the cases (Table III). A chi-square statistic was performed and determined the pattern of "hits and misses", $r = 7.99$, was significant ($p < .05$). Therefore, the discriminating function using control variables, provided enough information to

significantly exceed the prediction rate expected by chance in distinguishing hardship and non-hardship married men.

DISCUSSION

The rationale for this research highlights the need to integrate a diverse literature. Much of this work utilized a categorical definition of unemployment to define its independent variable (Berg, Freedman & Freeman, 1978); Dalia & Guest, 1975; Ginzberg, 1971; Tiffany, Cowan & Tiffany, 1970). As this perspective developed, outcomes became diverse and sometimes contradictory (Eisenberg & Lazarsfeld, 1938; Feather & Barber, 1983). This was particularly salient as researchers came to recognize the overlapping area of work and family relationships (Caplovitz, 1979; Chilman, 1975; Elder, 1974; Hoffman, 1985; Kanter, 1977; Komarovsky, 1964; Moen, 1979; Voydanoff, 1984). However, under this influence, outcomes became increasingly diverse, and personal contributions during difficult times were not assessed (Walker, 1985). The emphasis in this project was to use an integrating concept to unify the independent variable. It became possible to study a variety of types of underemployment within the broad characteristic of hardship. The quality which separated the hardship married men from husbands who do not experience significant financial reduction is their distinctive perception of the sense of control. Therefore, in communities which are experiencing economic disruption in the form of plant closure, company cut-backs and layoffs, the quality which requires support is the workers'

perception of control in their lives. This approach was applied in a reported intervention plan, and the results were promising (Young, 1986).

The male stereotype of autonomy received some validation from this analysis, unless tempered with discussion of the developmental importance of relationships (Erikson, 1966). Erikson believed personal growth occurred because people responded to environmental challenge. They overcame psychosocial crises by confronting a problem, recognizing personal vulnerability and overcoming perceived adversity. The movement toward an integrated sense of identity involved:

An optimal sense of identity, on the other hand, is experienced merely as a sense of psychosocial well-being. Its most obvious concomitants are a feeling of being at home in one's body, a sense of "knowing where one is going", and an inner assuredness of anticipated recognition from those who count (p. 165).

It is assumed for this discussion, husbands were involved in resolution of Erikson's psychosocial stage of Intimacy vs. Isolation. Their accumulated challenge area was in the realm of marital relations. For those in hardship, the world of work provided additional concern. Being in middle adulthood, these men brought with them the degree of identity achieved during adolescence (Identity vs. Identity Confusion). This stage, according to Erikson, is composed of four developmental tasks.

Task Identification vs. Sense of Futility

Husbands in the hardship group we likely to perceive their world as controlled by chance factors. This has implications for their future economic activity and the ongoing stability of their perception of the provider role. This finding implicates an important reality of plant closure and other corporate cutback strategies. As arguable responses to identified economic and corporate needs, these decisions are management adjustments, and typically, not open to input from workers (Gordus, Jarley & Ferman, 1981).

Therefore, workers who took a passive posture, may be tempted to assume the company will reopen, their job descriptions expand, or their wages increase. These views did not represent task identification well, exposed workers to the experience of futility, and were distractions from the important developmental challenge provided by the community. A more appropriate perspective may include the determination of what they can influence (a new job) from what is outside direct control (the old job after re-opening). Intervention may involve varieties of occupational models and supplemental information, i.e., resume writing, job search strategies, and techniques for gaining survival income, to elicit a different set of alternatives and produce active strategies. Excellent models (survivors of the depression) are likely available in senior citizen centers, willing to provide direction to underemployed workers.

Anticipation of Roles vs. Role Inhibition

A great deal of research underscored the need for flexibility in this particular arena. However, males are disadvantaged because a great deal of their marital role behavior is predicated on involvement in the world of work, expressed through the provider role. This orientation is particularly tenacious for men (Kanter, 1977), especially those in the working class (Dalia & Guest, 1975). In a number of ways, this traditional perspective was reflected in this analysis. Marital variables were not significantly different between groups or important in establishing a profile.

It is likely that married men, generally, were disconnected from their spouses in important ways. Therefore, this background highlights their personal experience of control rather than ongoing interactions when financially pressed. Perhaps this indicates a deficit in the preparation for and maintenance of marriage. Therefore, it may be enriching for both spouses to discuss and receive information in separate groups on confrontation as caring behavior, and receive materials on other relational phenomena. Wives may benefit from encouragement to avoid feeling responsible for their husband's activism. Male groups are more likely to benefit from learning to share, normalizing experienced feelings, and participating in group support.

Will to be Oneself vs. Self-Doubt

The lack of personal understanding may explain a perplexing finding among those interested in patterns of adjustment to

underemployment. Workers tended to remain anchored in their communities (Leff & Haft, 1983), and did not utilize community resources and retraining opportunities (Foltman, 1968; Mick, 1975). They were vulnerable to more passive postures even though aware involvement enhanced the probability of re-employment (Gordus, Jarley & Ferman, 1981).

In this sample, there was not a statistically meaningful difference between groups of married men regarding the perspective of control by powerful others. However, there was a substantial difference, and this may indicate a recognition on the part of many men in contributions of other people. Those with this orientation are as likely to be as active as internals (Levenson, 1974). Therefore, intervention personnel are providing a valuable service in direct recruitment for their programs. In other words, men may be responsive to personal and direct contact, and less amenable to mailed material and letters. Also, it is likely many men require a companion at workshops. Reluctance to attend meetings alone may explain poor participation rather than aversion to the material. Elder volunteers, accessible community leaders (i.e. ministers), and neighbors of those who are underemployed, may elevate participation in existing programs by incorporating mentoring behavior into their personal contacts.

Mutual Recognition vs. Autistic Isolation

Couples who are able to share the experience of financial hard times not only survive (Moen, 1980; Voydanoff, 1983), but

may ultimately enrich their marriage. There may be few marriages with this level of quality (Spanier & Lewis, 1980) prior to a crisis. In this research, internality is a characteristic of the non-hardship group. While it is possible these husbands believed they were in charge of their own lives, the retention of too much control is problematic (Fiske & Taylor, 1984; Kirchler, 1983; Ramey & Campbell, 1976). Therefore, internality may restrict options, and the individual considers only their personal perspective. The results of this analysis indicated control was significant, but the small variance accounted for and the limited association of the control function with the theoretical grouping variable, indicated more was involved in difference(s) between groups.

Therefore, further research is necessary regarding underemployment, marriage traits and personal qualities. For example, there is likely important information within the large non-hardship group, and more refined divisions will make it available. Also, there are apparent differences between the three perspectives of control, and efforts to describe these distinctions will add credibility to the construct. In addition, personal qualities which distinguish spouses require description. This information may aid couples who want to add potency to their relationship. Therefore, a great deal remains to clarify the complex blend of personal and marital qualities. For example, while sharing is a productive endeavor, it provides a paradox as well. Husbands regularly blame their wives for real and imagined adversity. (Zvonkovic, 1988). An important

descriptor of identity confusion is the invasive processes within some families of origin and between many spouses (Erikson, 1966) of adaptive behaviors. Part of the developmental process for married men, and recovery from vulnerability, may lie in their willingness to take individual responsibility, and the style and degree this allows spouses and others who care to participate.

Table I

(A) Mean Differences (N = 137)

	Hardship	Non-Hardship
Length of Marriage	15.05 (s.d. 12.05)	15.2 (s.d. 10.1)
Number of Children	1.05 (s.d. .98)	2.55 (s.d. 1.9)
Age	38.9 (s.d. 13.5)	40.3 (s.d. 9.99)
Time in the Community	17.05 (s.d. 17.05)	16.9 (s.d. 13.2)

($p > .10$)

(B) Percentage Differences (N = 137)

Education Level		
High school/ Trade school	8 (38%)	39 (34%)
College	9 (43%)	46 (40%)
Professional	2 (10%)	23 (20%)
Less than High School	2 (10%)	7 (6%)
TOTAL	21 (100%)	115 (100%)

($p > .10$)

Employment Status		
Full-time	(90%)	(94%)
Part-time	(9%)	(10%)
Unemployed	(5%)	(5%)

(Some participants worked more than one full-time job)

Table II

INDIVIDUAL AND MARITAL VARIABLE BY HARDSHIP AND NON-HARDSHIP GROUPS
(Means, Standard Deviations, and T Values)

	T-VALUE (two tailed)	SAMPLE	HARDSHIP	NON-HARDSHIP
Consensus (N=134)	.79 (df 132)	3.7 (sd .6)	3.7 (sd .57)	3.7 (sd .56)
Cohesion (N=134)	.68 (df 132)	3.1 (sd .8)	3.1 (sd .6)	3.1 (sd .8)
Fear of Success (N=134)	.06 (df 132)	4.06 (sd .5)	4.07 (sd .4)	4.04 (sd .5)
*Attitudes Toward Women	-1.28 (df 115)	2.95 (sd .53)	----	----
Internality (N=132)	-2.04 (df 130)	4.44 (sd .7)	4.14 (sd .8)	4.49 (sd .6)
Others Control (N=132)	.39 (df 130)	3.19 (sd .8)	3.14 (sd .7)	3.18 (sd .8)
Chance Control (N=131)	1.35 (df 129)	2.87 (sd .9)	3.15 (sd .8)	2.82 (sd .9)

*Excluded from further analysis because of the large number of missing values.

Table III

Stepwise Summary Table

Variables	Wilks' Lambda	Signifi-cance	Equivalent F
1) Internality	.965452	.0364	4.47
2) Others' control	.956483	.0634	2.82
3) Chance control	.937352	.0462	2.74

Eta^2 = .06265

Canonical Correlation = .2503

CLASSIFICATION RESULTS

ACTUAL GROUP	N of Cases	Predicted Group (1)	(2)
1 (Hardship)	22	13 (59.1%)	9 (40.9%)
2 (Non-hardship)	110	39 (35.5%)	71 (64.5%)
TOTAL	137		

Percentage of grouped cases correctly classified:

63.64%

REFERENCES

Abramson, L. & Sackheim, H. (1977). A paradox in depression: Uncontrolability and self-blame. Psychological Bulletin, 84, 5, 838-851.

Angell, R. (1936). The family encounters the depression (pp. 10-54). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Bakke, E. (1933). The unemployed man: A social study (pp. 246-282). London: Nisbet and Company.

Bednarzik, R. (1983). Layoffs and permanent job losses: Workers' traits and cyclical patterns. Monthly Labor Review, 106, 9, 3-12.

Berg, I., Freedman, M., & Freeman, M. (1978). The demand for and utilization of differentially educated American workers. In I. Berg, M. Freedman, & M. Freedman (Eds.) Managers and work reform: A limited engagement (pp. 75-109). New York: The Free Press.

Bishop, C. (1977). Hospitals: From secondary to primary labor market. Industrial Relations, 16, 1, 26-34.

Bluestone, B., Murphy, W. & Stevenson, M. (1973). Low wages and the working poor: Policy papers in human resources and industrial relations 22 (pp. 19-49). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, University of Michigan, Wayne State University.

Burris, B. (1983). No room at the top: Underemployment and alienation in the corporation. (pp. 284-300). New York: Praeger Press.

Buss, T. & Redburn, F. (1983). Shutdown at Youngstown: Public policy for mass unemployment. (pp. 35-59). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Caplowitz, D. (1979). Making ends meet: How families cope with inflation and recession (pp. 35-59). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Chilman, C. (1975). Families in poverty in the early 1970's: Rates, associated factors, some implications. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 37,1,49-60.

Clogg, C. (1979). Measuring underemployment: Demographic indicators for the United States (pp. 21-33). New York: Academic Press. Dalia, J. & Guest, A. (1973). Embourgeoisement among blue-collar workers. Sociology Quarterly, 16,3,291-304.

Dalia, J. & Guest, A. (1975), Embourgeoisement among blue-collar workers. Sociological Quarterly. 16, 3, 291-304.

Degrazia, R. (1982). Clandestine employment: A problem of our times. In V. Tanzi (Ed.) The underground economy in the United States and abroad (pp. 47-67). Lexington, MS: D.C. Heath and Company.

Eisenberg, P. & Lazarsfeld, P. (1938). The psychological effects of unemployment. Psychological Bulletin, 35, 358- 390.

Elder, G. (1974). Children of the great depression: Social change in life experience (pp. 83-117). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Erikson, E. (1968). Identity: Youth and culture (pp. 91-96). New York: W.W. Norton.

Etaugh, E. (1975). Stability of college students' attitudes toward women during one school year. Psychological Reports, 36, 125-126.

Feather, N. & Barber, J. (1983). Depressive reactions and unemployment. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 29, 2, 185-195.

Flaim, P. (1984). Unemployment in 1982: The cost to workers and their families. Monthly Labor Review, Feb., 30-37.

Fiske, S. & Taylor, s. (1984). Social Cognition (pp. 100-138). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing.

Foltman, F. (1968). White- and blue-collars in a mill shutdown: A case of relative redundancy (pp. 75-119). Ithaca, NY: W. F. Humphrey Press.

Ginzberg, E. (1971). The long view. In S. Levitan (Ed.). Blue collar workers: A symposium on Middle America (pp. 20-46). New York: McGraw Hill.Glyde, G. (1977). Underemployment: Definition and causes. Journal of Economic Issues, 11,2,245-260.

Glyde, G. (1977). Underemployment: Definition and causes. Journal of Economic Issues, 11, 2, 245-260.

Gordon, D. (1972). Theories of poverty and underemployment. (pp. 111-132). Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath & Company.Gordus, J.,

Gordus, J., Jarley, P. & Ferman, L. (1981). Plant closings and economic dislocation (pp. 127-149). Kalamazoo, MI,: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

Guadagno, M. (1983). Economic stress: Family financial management. In H. McCubbin & C. Figley (Eds.). Stress and the family: Vol. 1. Coping with normative transitions (pp. 201-217). New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Healey, M. (1984). Components of locational change in multi-plant enterprises. Urban Studies, 20, 3, 327-342.

Helmreich, R., Spence, J. & Gibson, R. (1980). Sex-role attitudes 1972-1980. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 8, 4, 656-663.

Herr, D. & Cramer, S. (1988). Career Guidance and Counseling through the Lifespan: Systematic Approaches (3rd Ed.) (pp. 66-74). Glenvina, IL: Scott, Foresman & Co.

Hill, M. & Corcoran, M. (1979). Unemployment in 1982: The cost to workers and their families. Monthly Labor Review, 102, 11, 30-37.

Hill, R. (1949). Families under stress: Adjustment to the crisis war and reunion (pp. 8-21). New York: Harper and Brothers.

Hoffman, L. (1985). Work, family, and the child. Master's Lecture Series. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Kampe, R., & Lindemood, W. (1969). Underemployment estimates by county, United States, 1960. (Agricultural Economic Report 166, Economic Research Service). Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Agriculture.

Kanter, R. (1977) Work and family in the United States: A critical review and a guide for research and policy (pp. 81-115). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

King, D. (1977). Comment to underemployment: Definitions and causes. Journal of Economic Issues, 11, 2, 265-267.

Kirchler, E. (1983). Job loss and mood. Journal of Economic Psychology, 6, 9-25.

Klecka, W. (1975). Discriminant analysis. In N., Nie, C. Hull, J. Jenkins, K. Steinbrenner & D. Bent (Eds.). SPSS: Statistical package for the social sciences (pp. 443-467). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Corporation.

Komarovsky, M. (1964) Blue-Collar Marriage (pp. 280-310). New York: Vintage Books of Random House.

Leff, W. & Haft, M. (1983). Time without work: People who are not working tell their stories - how they feel - what they do-how they survive (pp. 3-48). Boston: South End Press.

Levenson, H. (1973). Activism and powerful others: Distinctions within the concept of internal-external control. Journal of Personality Assessment, 38, 377-383.

Levitan, S., Mangum, G. & Marshall, R. (1981). Human resources and labor markets: Employment and training in the American economy (pp. 25-49). New York: Harper and Row.

Liker, J. & Elder, G. (1983). Economic hardship and marital relations in the 1930's. American Sociological Review, 48, 3, 343-359.

McCubbin, H. & Patterson, J. (1982). Family stress, coping and social support. /n H. McCubbin, A. Cauble, & J. Patterson (Ed.S.). Family adaptation to crisis (pp. 26-47). Springfield, ILL: Charles C. Thomas.

Menaghan, E. (1983). Individual coping efforts and family studies: Conceptual and methodological issues. In H. McCubbin, M. Sussman, & J. Patterson (Eds.). Social stress and the family: Advances and developments in family stress theory and research (pp. 113-135). New York: Haworth Press.

Mick, S. (1975). Social and personal costs of plant shutdowns. Industrial Relations, 14, 2, 203-207.

Mirowsky, J. & Ross, D. (1983). Paranoia and the structure of powerlessness. American Sociological Review, 48, 2, 228-239.

Moen, P. (1979). Family impacts of the 1975 recession: Duration of unemployment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41, 3, 561-572.

Moen, P. (1983). Preventing financial hardship: Coping strategies of families of the unemployed. In H. McCubbin, A. Cauble & J. Patterson, (Eds.). American families and the economy: The high costs of living (pp. 213-259). Washington D.C.: National Academy Press.

Moen, P. (1980) Work-family linkages: Problems, payoffs and policy implications. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, New York: Department of Human Development and Family Studies, Cornell University.

Moen, P., Kain, E., & Elder, G. (1983). Economic conditions and family life: Contemporary and historical perspectives. In R. Nelson & F. Skidnoure (Eds.). American families and the economy: The high costs of living (pp. 213-259). Washington D.C.: National Academy Press.

Molefsky, B. (1982). America's underground economy. In V. Tanzi (Ed.) The underground economy in the United States and abroad (pp. 47-67). Lexington, MS: D.C. Heath and Company.

Norusis, M. (1985). Discriminant analysis. In M. Norusis, SPSSx: Advanced statistics guide (pp. 73-121). Chicago, IL: SPSSx.

O'Farrell, P. & Crouchley, R. (1985). Employment change in permanent manufacturing plants: Analysis and implications from an Irish case study. Environment and Planning A, 17, 3, 333-353.

Ramey, C. & Campbell, F. (1976). Parental attitudes and poverty. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 128,1,3-6.

Saubourin, S., Laporte, L. & Wright, J. (1990). Problem Solving, self-appraisal and coping efforts in distressed on nondistressed couples. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 16, 1, 89-97.

Schiller, B. (1984). The economics of poverty and discrimination pp. 42-73). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Slifman, L. (1976). Job mobility and labor demand. Industrial Relations, 15,2,147-157.

Spanier, G. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38. 15-28.

Spanier, G. & Lewis, R. (1980). Marital quality: A review of the seventies. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42,4,825-839.

Strube, M. & Werner, C. (1985). Relinquishment of control and the Type A behavior pattern. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48,3,688-701.

Sullivan, T. (1978). Marginal workers, marginal jobs: The under-utilization of American workers (pp. 150-165; pp. 25-44). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Tabachnick, B. & Fidall, L. (1983). Using multivariate statistics (Chapt. 9). New York: Harper and Row.

Thomas, K. & Wister, A. (1984). Living arrangements of older women: The ethnic dimension. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46, 2, 301-311.

Tiffany, D., Cowan, J., and Tiffany, P. (1970). The underemployed: A social-psychological portrait (pp.23-37). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Voydanoff, P. (1983). Unemployment: Family strategies for adaptation. In C. Figley & H. McCubbin (Eds.). Stress and the family: Vol. 2. Coping and catastrophe (pp. 90-102). New York: Haworth Press.

Walker, A. (1985). Reconceptualizing family stress. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 47, 4, 827-837.

Young, R. (1986). Counseling the unemployed: Attributional issues. Journal of Counseling and Development, 64, 6, 374-382.

Zuckerman, M. & Allison, S. (1976). An objective measure of fear of success: Construction and validation. Journal of Personality Assessment, 40,4, 422-430.

Zvonkovic, A., Guss, T., & Ladd, L. (1988). Making the most of job loss: Individual and marital features of underemployment. Family Relations, 37, 1, 56-61.

Zvonkovic, A. (1988). Underemployment: Individual and marital adjustment to income loss. Lifestyles, 9,2, 161-178.

b:guss.iuh